

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated July 31, 2006.

The Amendment previously filed was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

In support of the objection, the Examiner alleges that, “[t]he specification does not support checking whether the sub controller is controlling external communication and it does not support powering off the sub controller when the external communication has not been controlled,” (Office Action, page 3, line 20, to page 4, line 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, page 10, lines 3-9, of the specification provide that, “[t]he main CPU 201 monitors the external communication operation of the sub CPU 202 to determine whether the halt time period during which the sub CPU 202 does not perform any external communication control exceeds a predetermined time-out period. When the halt time exceeds the predetermined time-out period, the main CPU 201 instructs the power supply circuit 208 to stop supplying power to the sub CPU 202,” (emphasis supplied). It is respectfully submitted that this portion of the specification, for example, supports both the feature of checking whether the sub controller is controlling external communication and the feature of powering off the sub controller when the external communication has not been controlled, contrary to the Examiner’s contention. Therefore, the Examiner’s objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zhou (US2003/0003973), in view of Cannon (WO 94/17502). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] power supply control method in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device....”

Independent claim 6 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] power supply control system in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a

main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device....”

Independent claim 9 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] portable communication device comprising: ... an external connector; a sub CPU for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through the external connector and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device....”

Independent claim 10 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program instructing a computer to implement a power supply control method in a portable communication device provided with a plurality of controllers including a main controller and a sub controller for controlling external communication, the external communication including wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device....”

Antecedent basis for the amendments to independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 10 is found in the specification, for example, on page 9, lines 13-21, and in the drawings in, for example, Fig. 2.

The Examiner alleges that Zhou et al. discloses a cellular radio device, which the Examiner contends is the equivalent of the sub controller for controlling external communication of independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 10, citing the Abstract, paragraphs [0015] to [0016], Figure 1, elements 1, 2, and 4, and Figure 2, elements 57 and 58, (Office Action, page 5, lines 1-3; page 6, lines 5-7; page 7, lines 3-4; page 8, lines 14-15). With regard to the feature of claim 3, before amendment herein, that “the external communication is wired communication with an external information processing device through an external connector,” (Office Action, page 5, line 20, to page 6, line 1), the Examiner contends that this feature is shown by Cannon, citing page 5, lines 20-26; page 6, lines 31-35, and Figure 1, elements 101, 103, 118, 119, and 128 of Cannon, (Office Action, page 6, lines 1-2).


The independent claims, as amended, however, require both wired communication through an external connector in the portable communication device and radio communication for location registration of the portable communication device, that combination neither being disclosed, taught, nor suggested by Zhou et al. and Cannon et al., individually or in combination. Specifically, in Zhou et al., Fig. 2 shows a cellular radio device, which is allegedly equivalent to the sub controller of the independent claims. However, that cellular radio device does not contain any external connector for wired communication nor is there any suggestion that it is adapted for wired communication. Attempting to combine Cannon, which appears to show an RF communication device 101 coupled to a computing device 103 by a serial bus 119, (page 5, lines 20-22; page 6, lines 31-35; Fig. 1), with Zhou et al. still does not produce the features of the independent claims since, as previously mentioned, there is no provision in the cellular radio device of Zhou et al. for wired communication. Nor can the radio communication of Cannon be said to be equivalent to the radio communication of the amended independent claims since the radio communication claimed is for location registration of the portable communication device and such radio communication is nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested in Cannon.

Since each of claims 2-5, 7-8, and 11-12 is directly or indirectly dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 6, and 10, each of claims 2-5, 7-8, and 11-12 is allowable over Zhou et al. in view of Cannon for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, and 10 over Zhou et al. in view of Cannon.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-12 is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON OCTOBER 20, 2006


MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700